What this bill does is basically say to the young investigator, we will give you some help in advancing your career so you can make a second run at this. This is supported by the National Science Foundation. Folks who have done this research, and I have written applications for grants, I am sure Dr. Ehlers has, it takes you a while to learn how to do it.

Sometimes the young professors who are the very people who are teaching the undergraduate classes, trying to get their labs put up, they lack the resources. And on top of that, you need to understand the dynamics of the peer review process.

Sometimes the more senior members, the people with the long established research credentials and careers are just going to have more access to research because the peer reviewers are going to say, look, it is a safe bet to bet on this guy or this woman, they have been around a long time. The unknown person, the new person who may hold the promise of tomorrow, has a comparative disadvantage.

□ 2145

So what we are trying to do is in a small way, a relatively small way with this program, redress the difference between the new investigators. We know what that's like. We have been relatively young Members, not so anymore here in the Congress. We have had the senior Members tell us where the bathroom was, to quit voting with our meal cards and stuff like that. Nobody threw us out. They get a second chance. But what I am saying, that's what this is about.

I profoundly respect the gentleman. I hope he knows that. He is committed to try to reduce the deficit. This is not the way to do it. This program is actually a good program. It's by a host of scientists, a host of scientific bodies. I think we ought to defeat the gentleman's amendment, with respect, because I know his intent. In this case I think he would have an adverse effect on what we are trying to do with this legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I appreciate the valiant effort on behalf of my friend from Washington in attempting to dissuade Members from voting against this amendment, which I think is well founded. I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona for offering it.

I would remind the gentleman from Washington that one of the roles of our office, one of the roles of our office is to assist individuals with grant applications. So there are other resources which the Federal Government supplies for individuals who are searching to try to fill out their grant applications. We are happy to help.

I would also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman makes the point, appropriately, that only 25 percent of the grants are accepted. So why should we waste Federal dollars on teaching individuals who have other avenues to be able to determine how to fill out their grant application appropriately?

Why should we waste precious Federal dollars that could go to, in fact, the kinds of cures that he is endeavoring to fund with the moneys that he is promoting? Why should we waste those Federal dollars in this kind of endeavor, which, I think, is frankly ill-founded and not needed.

I am pleased to yield to my good friend from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me point out I have the utmost respect for my friend from Washington. We have worked together on many issues. First, he mentioned that the private sector groups are in support of this legislation and the National Science Foundation. I have no doubt. It doesn't surprise me at all. But I would submit that that's akin to the government saying we are in a position now to fund free lunches for everyone out there, and you can do it on the government's dime.

I would say that virtually every company in America would say that's a great idea. Now we don't have to fund that. We don't have to subsidize it for our employees. We can keep the profits, invest them elsewhere. If private companies don't have to expend that money in their R&D budgets, they would like not to. But that was a point I made, that this often supplants money that would be invested in the private sector, probably more efficiently if overall government spending is any guide.

To the amendment in specific, the gentleman from Georgia said it well. With all the high-priority items in the National Science Foundation budget, to take money out of that and to give it to those who didn't present a successful proposal would seem to me not the highest-priority use of money.

Remember, this is a new program. I am not cutting a program that exists. This is a new pilot project. I just don't think this is a road that we want to go down. I started to mention, before my time ran out before, we have seen this in other fields, in other earmark fields, where people are funding business consortiums. Many of the earmarks in this body go to business consortiums to help them draft grant proposals to get other earmarks or to get grants from government or to lobby to get earmarks. It's simply not a road that we want to go down as a Congress, I would submit.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman, and I commend him for his amendment.

I am pleased to yield to my good friend from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, to the gentleman from Arizona, I totally agree with your comments about earmarks. I have fought hard here to keep this body and the other body from providing earmarks for scientific research, because all grants should go through the peer review process.

I might also add parenthetically that when the gentleman from Arizona was on the antiearmark bandwagon a few years ago, I believe I voted with him more than most Members of the House, because I oppose earmarks in general, but particularly in scientific research.

I would also comment that the fact that industry supports us is not indicative of the National Science Foundation doing industry's research. National Science Foundation does the basic research, the fundamental research, which has no apparent immediate use. Industry picks up on that and says, okay, let's see whether we can develop something out of that. In other words, industry does not do very much research, they do a lot of development. NSF does almost totally research and essentially no development. So it's a very good symbiotic relationship.

As I mentioned earlier, before most of the people here were on the floor, the rate of return on our research money in the National Science Foundation has been incredible. Any accountant looking at this would say this is the best investment that the United States Government makes because it has great results in our economy.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, as it is getting rather late, I would ask unanimous consent that we limit debate on subsequent amendments to 10 minutes.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I object.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will designate section 7.

The text of section 7 is as follows:

SEC. 7. BROADER IMPACTS MERIT REVIEW CRITERION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating research proposals under the Foundation's broader impacts criterion, the Director shall give special consideration to proposals that involve partnerships between academic researchers and industrial scientists and engineers that address research areas that have been identified as having high importance for future national economic competitiveness, such as nanotechnology.

(b) PARTNERSHIPS WITH INDUSTRY.—The Director shall encourage research proposals from institutions of higher education that involve partnerships with businesses and organizations representing businesses in fields that have been identified as having high importance for future national economic competitiveness and that include input on the research agenda from and cost-sharing by the industry partners.